

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated September 9, 2005. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 5-7 and 12-14 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-16 are being cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5-7 and 12-14 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim applicants' invention.

The specification and the claims are being amended to correct formal errors and/or to better recite or describe the features of the present invention as claimed. All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

The specification was objected to and the Examiner requested correction of any minor errors in the specification. The claims were objected to for various formal errors. Claims 2-7 and 9-14 were recited under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

As indicated, the specification and the claims are being amended as required by the Examiner. Accordingly, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejection is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-7 and 12-14 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the 112 rejection and into independent form to include the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims.

As claims 5-7 and 12-14 are being rewritten to overcome the 112 rejection and into independent form to include the limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims, they are now in condition for allowance.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Application No. 2002/0169901 to Fujibayashi et al. in view of US Patent No. 5,872,944 to Goldrian et al. Claims 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujibayashi '901 in view of Goldrian '944, and further in view of *The Microsoft Computer Dictionary*.

As claims 1-4, 8-11 and 15-16 without prejudice or disclaimer, the rejections thus become moot.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

October 12, 2005

SPF/JCM/JT